

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

The legend --(PRIOR ART)-- has been added to each of Figures 1A and 1B,  
as shown on the replacement sheet attached hereto.

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated September 6, 2005, the Examiner stated Figures 1A and 1B should be designated as "PRIOR ART." In response, each of Figures 1A and 1B has been amended to include the legend --(PRIOR ART)-- therein.

The drawings were objected to because the Examiner stated Figure 7A included a reference designation DS, which was not described in the written portion of the specification. In response, the paragraph beginning at page 9, line 10 has been amended to use this reference designation to identify the already-described dielectric layers. This paragraph also has been editorially revised to change "levels" to --layers-- with regard to the metallization ME.

The drawings also were objected to because the Examiner stated the "insulation" in claim 24 must be shown in the drawings. The term "insulation" in claim 24 resulted from an inaccurate translation of the corresponding claim in the original German application. This term should have been translated as "isolation" rather than "insulation," and merely refers to the separation, in terms of dB, between the transmission path and the reception path. As such, there is no physical component that can be shown in the drawings that represents such an "isolation," and therefore in view of the amendment to claim 24, no change in the drawings is seen to be necessary.

Typographical errors in claims 1 and 7 were noted, which have been corrected.

Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 23 was rejected because of a lack of antecedent basis for the term "said stack" therein. This rejection of claim 23 has been overcome by

amending claim 23 to depend from claim 22, which provides antecedent basis for the term "said stack."

The above discussion regarding claim 24, and the amendment thereof, also respond to the rejection of claim 24 under §112.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in full compliance with all provisions of §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10-17, 19-21, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tikka et al. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 19, 21, 22, 25, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and §102(e) as being anticipated Ella et al. '866. Claims 18, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ella et al. '866, further in view of Ella et al. '756 and Ella et al. '171.

In response, independent claim 1 has been amended to state that the reception bandpass filter is formed by a first partial filter and a second partial filter, the first partial filter being either a ladder-type reactance filter or a lattice-type reactance filter, and being formed by a number of bulk acoustic wave resonators. The second partial filter is stated to be a balun, and has an acoustic track with a number of surface acoustic wave transducers that are acoustically coupled to each other in the longitudinal direction of the acoustic track.

Support of these additions to claim 1 are present in the specification as originally filed at page 10, lines 35-36, page 11, lines 4-5 and 15-21 and 29-32, as well as Figures 7C, 7D and 9A.

The fact that the second partial filter is a balun means that it has an unbalanced (asymmetrical) port and a balanced (symmetrical) port.

The reception filter in claim 1, therefore, is composed of an SAW partial filter and a BAW partial filter, and the SAW partial filter is a balun formed by SAW transducers that are acoustically coupled to each other.

The Tikka et al. reference does not disclose a duplexer having a reception bandpass filter comprised of a first partial filter and a second partial filter as set forth in claim 1, and therefore the Tikka et al. reference does not anticipate claim 1, or any of the claims depending therefrom.

The Ella et al. '866 reference is concerned exclusively with BAW components. For example, the partial ladder-type filter 150 shown in Figures 9-13 of Ella et al. '866 is based on BAW resonators, as described at column 6, line 29 of the Ella et al. '866 reference. The Ella et al. '866 reference, therefore, does not disclose a duplexer having a reception bandpass filter that is a combination of a partial SAW filter and a partial BAW filter. Moreover, the circuit disclosed in the Ella et al. '866 reference has a balun containing BAW resonators. By contrast, the balun set forth in claim 1 of the present application is a SAW component.

The same is true regarding Ella et al. '756 and Ella et al. '171. Those references concern only BAW components. Therefore, even if the circuit disclosed in the Ella et al. '866 reference were modified in view of the teachings of Ella et al. '756 and/or Ella et al. '171, the subject matter of claims 18 and 24 (claim 23 having been cancelled), which embody the subject matter of claim 1 therein, still would not result.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,

*Steven H. Noll*

(Reg. 28,982)

**SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP**

**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

Patent Department

6600 Sears Tower

233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: 312/258-5790

Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4408082.1